

2003 Spring BRAC Minutes

May 7th & 8th, 2003

Pierce County Environmental Service Building, Lakewood Washington

Introduction and Opening Remarks

Al King brought the meeting to order at 8:30 am on May 7th, 2003 at the Pierce County Environmental Service Building in Lakewood, Washington. For the first order of business, people present introduced themselves. The following is a list of attendees:

Name	Representing	Phone	Term	Email
Jeff Cameron	City of Longview	360-442-5221	2003	jcameron@ci.longview.wa.us
Richard Miller	City of Seattle	206-684-5300	2004	richard.miller@ci.seattle.wa.us
Dan Kaufman	City of Kennewick	509-585-4286	2005	daniel-kaufman@ci.kennewick.wa.us
Rory Routh	City of Bellingham	360-676-6961	2006	rrouthe@cob.org
Bob Turpin	Jefferson County	360-385-9173	2006	bturpin@co.jefferson.wa.us
Gene Soules	Yakima County	509-574-2324	2003	genes@co.yakima.wa.us
Jerry Bryant	Pierce County	253-798-7250	2004	jbryant@co.pierce.wa.us
Derek Pohle	Grant County	509-754-6082	2005	publicworks@grantcounty-wa.com
Al King	WSDOT H&LP	360-705-7375	---	kinga@wsdot.wa.gov
Greg Kolle	WSDOT H&LP	360-705-7379	---	kolleg@wsdot.wa.gov
Grant Griffin	WSDOT H&LP	360-705-7870		griffin@wsdot.wa.gov
Harvey Coffman	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2556	---	coffmah@wsdot.wa.gov
Dave Bruce*	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2570	---	bruced@wsdot.wa.gov
Hugh Ritter	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2538		RitterH@wsdot.wa.gov
Stuart Bennion	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2536		BennioS@wsdot.wa.gov
Barry Brecto	FHWA	360-753-9482		Barry.Brecto@fhwa.dot.gov
Ken Bamford	Kittitas County	509-962-7017		KBam@co.kittitas.wa.us
Darrell Ash	Snohomish County	425-388-6688		Darrell.ash@co.snohomish.wa.us
Steve Nicholls	Nicholls Engineering	509-921-6747		nicheng@ix.netcom.com
David McMullen	KPFF Consulting Eng.	206-622-5822		davidm@kpff.com
Jim Schmidt	Kleinfelder Inc.	425-562-4200		jschmidt@kleinfelder.com
Lorne Balanko	HWA Geosciences	425-774-0106		lbalko@hwageo.com
Al Walley	HW Lochner	360-951-2790		Awalley@HWLochner.com
Kevin Kim	Entranco	425-454-5600		Kim@Entranco.com
Benton Cook	Vector Engineering	360-352-2477		bscll@vectorengineeringinc.com
Dan Soderling	City of Tacoma	253-591-5263		DSoderli@ci.tacoma.wa.us
Steve Shanafelt	City of Tacoma	253-591-5525		SShanafe@ci.tacoma.wa.us

* Technical Committee Members

Greg Kolle distributed and reviewed the list of the BRAC members and the meeting agenda. Notes from the 2002 Fall BRAC meeting were also distributed for reference.

BRAC History

Kathleen Davis, Director of Highways & Local Programs, briefly addressed the Committee. Kathleen thanked the Committee members for their service and complimented them on their history of good work.

Kathleen officially announced that the Major Maintenance program for local agency bridges had been accepted by FHWA and that the first on-system bridge candidates would be selected during this 2003 Spring BRAC meeting. She also mentioned the ongoing effort to make the Major Maintenance program available for off-system bridges as well. Kathleen emphasized the continued need to move projects along and to obligate the funds. She briefly touched on the 2006 deadline for the bridge projects selected before the year 2000 to move to the construction phase.

Kathleen told the Committee about changes being made to the Transportation Improvement Board's (TIB) funding criteria. The new criteria are aimed at improving TIB's ability to assist with projects funded with bridge replacement dollars.

Kathleen also related her expectations for the next federal transportation act. She expressed her hope that the local agencies will continue to play a major role in developing the proposal for reauthorization. She also mentioned that other States want to emulate Washington with respect to our reauthorization process and how decisions are made with local agency input.

Kathleen then fielded some questions from the Committee before she had to leave for another meeting. Most of the questions revolved around the environmental process and the difficulty in moving projects in a reasonable amount of time. In response to this line of questions, Barry Brecto mentioned that FHWA is working with other federal agencies to help expedite the environmental process. Barry told the Committee that FHWA is moving ahead on projects when no comments are returned in a reasonable amount of time. He said that if FHWA has received no comments, a letter is sent to the services outlining conditions consistent with past projects and informing them that the project will move ahead.

BRAC Funding

Greg reminded the Committee of the proposed funding split for the 2003 BRAC meetings. The split is as follows:

Program	Replacement	Rehabilitation	Preventive Maint.
Spring	\$20 million	\$10 million	\$3 million
Fall	\$20 million	—	—

2003 Spring BRAC Minutes

The actual split for the 2003 Spring BRAC meeting will be determined after the candidates in the three programs have been presented.

Obligated Projects: Greg Kolle gave the Committee a handout that listed all outstanding projects. Greg explained that projects that have federal aid numbers have turned in their prospectus and have obligated the bridge funds. He also explained that once a project draws construction money it is removed from the list. The construction dates listed on the table are, for the most part, a best guess made with the information obtained from the local agencies. The handout shows a backlog of approximately \$200 million. Greg and Al explained some possible scenarios to address the obligation problems if a large number of projects selected before January 1, 2000 move to construction shortly before the June 1, 2006 deadline as required by the Cost Containment Policy. A letter to remind agencies with older projects of the deadline has been drafted and will be submitted to the Committee for comment.

Greg commented on the effect of inflation on these older projects. A project estimated at \$20 million at the time of selection may well be a \$100 million project in today's dollars. Greg also mentioned that FHWA is questioning why some of the older projects aren't moving. Greg reported that construction costs continue to rise on the west side of the mountains but he said that the east side balances the impact to the program.

Greg reported that \$62 million was obligated in 2002 demonstrating the effort of the agencies to move the projects along. The older projects listed on the handout are color-coded. Greg pointed out that the number of these projects is dwindling.

Greg went on to outline the candidates to be presented during this meeting. The funding categories are Replacement, Rehabilitation, and Major Maintenance. An overview of the applicants is as follows:

Program	Replacement	Rehabilitation	Major Maintenance
Number of Candidates	31	4	7
Estimated Total Cost	\$70 million	\$19 million	\$3 million

Greg also explained the process for compiling the list of bridges to be normalized by the Bridge Preservation office for the 2003 Fall BRAC meeting. He told the Committee that the list is pulled from the information in the WSBIS. He looks for sufficiency Ratings of 60 and below. He then looks at the elements in poor condition. Timber bridges are given priority status and a first cut is made. This list is sent to Bridge Preservation for inspection. The agencies are then invited to have their bridge candidate considered during the fall BRAC meeting. The agencies won't always be interested in having the BRAC consider every bridge on the list but the inspections of additional bridges provide a backlog of inspections that will allow for more manageable lists in the years to come. This year's list is 40 – 60 bridges and Greg expects a good candidate list for the Fall.

State of Our Local Agency Bridges

Training Classes: Grant Griffin told the Committee about the consistently good attendance we have been experiencing for the Bridge Condition Inspection Training classes. Grant pointed out that the Fundamentals and Bridge Inspection Training have been full while there has been good attendance to the Updates classes. Additional Fundamentals and Update classes were added for the '03 training season. The additional fundamentals class was actually in November '02 in Vancouver and the additional Updates class was in Spokane in April. There doesn't seem to be a need for two Updates classes on the east side since each class had only 15 students instead of one class of 30. The students indicated that one class alternating between Spokane and Ellensburg would work well for the majority of them.

Planning for the Pacific Northwest Bridge Maintenance Conference is underway. A conference coordinator has been hired to organize the 2004 event. Washington State University Conference & Professional Programs has signed on to provide professional assistance to the conference committee which is made up of members from each participating state and FHWA northwest area bridge engineers. This event has grown in popularity and attendance has increased each year since its inception in April 2000. The conference is held every-other-year and moves from April to October in 2004.

Traffic Damage to Structural Elements: Grant gave a brief summary of bridges that had sustained damage requiring a Critical Damage Bridge Repair Report (CDBRR). He pointed out that agencies are doing a good job of recognizing the need for this more in-depth tracking of the damage and repair. Agencies are using the updated information in Chapter 7 of the Bridge Inspection Manual to provide guidance along with help from the H&LP Bridge Office.

Grant related an experience Lewis County recently had while dealing with damage done to the Newaukum River Bridge. The contract costs were higher because of the effort to get the bridge repaired and back to full service as quickly as possible. As a result, the insurance company is balking at the costs. In this situation, it may have been better to post the bridge and delay the repair in order to do the repairs at a more reasonable cost.

Grant also mentioned the good experience Whatcom County had repairing a high load hit to the Nooksack River Bridge. This damage didn't require a CDBRR but was an example of a successful repair working with the party that did the damage, an independent consulting firm, and the Bridge Office at H&LP.

File Inspection Procedure Review: Grant reported that the local agencies are doing a good job with their bridge programs. He has seen constant improvement in the bridge files with the agencies putting the information learned during training classes and file reviews into practice. The general attitude across the State is that the local agencies are dedicated to doing things right. The agencies that need work know it and can tell us

what they are doing and what they plan to do to improve their program. The next focus will be working with the bridge condition inspectors to improve bridge inspections and the bridge inspection reports. The goal is to improve the notes and BMS portion of the reports while improving consistency within the reports.

Inspection/Load Rating/Scour Evaluations: Agencies are demonstrating continued improvement in the inspection data turned in for updating. All agencies have voluntarily compiled Bridge Management System (BMS) data for their bridges. They are recognizing the value of the data as a tool for writing consistent bridge inspection reports. Grant related the good response he is receiving for field reviews of inspection procedures. For many inspectors this is the only feedback they have gotten on fieldwork since their bridge inspector training course and they appreciate the input.

Load ratings are also being continually improved. The agencies recognize what deficiencies to look for and are correcting problems. They are also calling the H&LP Bridge Office with questions about load ratings when they are not sure that they are correct. Other agencies are recalculating load ratings that they recognize as deficient.

Scour evaluations need improvement and the agencies will be getting updated and clarified information during the 2003 training classes. The H&LP Bridge Office will be working with the WSDOT Hydraulic Office to provide better guidance. The Hydraulics office continues to work on the new guidance but have been sidetracked by other demands on their time.

High Cost Bridge Inspection Program: Grant reported that 65, twelve year; high cost bridge inspection agreements have been executed. Additional agreements are being prepared as bridges needing high cost inspections are being identified and added to the master list. The master list is constantly being fine tuned and the high cost inspection frequencies are being adjusted in accordance with the Bridge Inspection Manual. The inspection frequency continues to be an important issue as the Bridge Preservation office's manpower and equipment are taxed by continued access problems for many of the State owned bridges on high volume routes.

The following is a tally of the High Cost Inspections from 2002

- Approximately 140 UBIT/Fracture critical inspections
- Approximately 70 Routine for Small Counties (Garfield, Wahkiakum)
- 28 Underwater by consultant

An amendment has been made to Columbia County's agreement to take over their routine inspections. Their agreement is now similar to the small county agreements in place for Garfield and Wahkiakum Counties. The first round of routine inspections is scheduled for the 2003 inspection season.

FHWA NBIS Comments: Barry Brecto, FHWA area Bridge Engineer for Washington

State, commented on his reviews of the Local Agency bridge programs. Barry said that, in general, the agencies are doing a good job with their programs. A couple of weaknesses have been identified such as the need for additional scour evaluation guidance and the need for written procedures for underwater inspections. The previous underwater inspection report along with the local agency version of the scope of work had previously been used as underwater inspection procedures in the past. Barry pointed out that this was not correct and that the reports and scope of work should be used to write actual procedures. These two points were focused on in the Updates classes last winter. Barry also noted that coding accuracy is improving.

Barry then gave the Committee some information on changes to the performance measures used by FHWA. FHWA tracks deficient bridges by deck area. Barry pointed out that Washington State's deficient bridges are predominantly Functionally Obsolete (FO) where as many States, especially as you look east, are predominately Structurally Deficient (SD). Washington State's bridges are approximately 75% FO and many eastern states have just the opposite, 75% SD. These statistics are the result of new performance measures used by FHWA that track deficient bridges by deck area instead of simply by number of bridges. The deck area measurements better reflect costs associated with bridge repair and replacement. The tracking was broken into four categories based on NHS with ADT greater or less than 50,000 and Non-NHS with ADT greater or less than 10,000.

Barry also told the Committee that FHWA is increasing its focus on construction. Barry will be conducting bridge construction reviews and he expects Greg Kolle will assist for Local Agency reviews. He mentioned that FHWA is becoming more directive as opposed to collaborative.

Technical Committee: Greg Kolle and Dave Bruce briefly explained the role of the technical committee. Greg gave a little history and explained the terms and rotation of the members. Greg also told the committee about the fine tuning of the '03 Spring BRAC list that occurred as a result of the technical committee meeting. A number of candidates were determined ineligible while questions about others resulted in a lower sufficiency rating and a better ranking on the prioritized list. For the Spring meetings, projects are occasionally found to fit better into one of the other programs. These suggested changes often improve a project's chances of being selected.

Dave Bruce also told the committee of a change of normalization inspectors from Bridge Preservation for the '03 Fall BRAC. Hugh Ritter and Stuart Bennion will be replacing Jerald Dodson and Susan Mazikowski. Susan has taken leave to pursue her master's degree.

Normalization: Al King passed out a series of graphs that show the effect of normalization on the sufficiency rating as compared to the rating generated with the Local Agency coding. The graphs represented the candidates from 1999 to 2002. The data shows that whether or not a bridge gets selected is not a function of the sufficiency rating but rather a function of time. Bridges get selected sooner or later; fine tuning the sufficiency rating may only hasten that selection. Al pointed out the checks and

balances already in place to ensure correct ranking such as inspector training, Technical Committee reviews, and Preliminary Project Site Reviews. Al asked the committee if they felt there was sufficient value obtained to continued spending an average of \$40 thousand to as high as \$60 thousand a year from the bridge replacement budget. Al pointed out that the question isn't whether or not to cut Bridge Preservation out of the BRAC process but whether or not normalization is necessary.

After some discussion the Committee decided no change was necessary or desirable. In general the Committee felt that normalizing offered credibility to the program. When asked his opinion, Barry Brecto stated that he felt normalization offered a higher level of accountability. Others felt normalization served to keep the local agencies honest in their coding. The advantages of having inspectors who have seen every candidate available during the Technical Committee meeting were also discussed. The consensus of the Committee was that things are working well and they see no need for change.

WSDOT Voting Members: The next subject Al King wanted to address was the issue of the two voting BRAC members from WSDOT. Al reminded the Committee of the origins of the BRAC and that initially the Committee decided all bridge projects, both State and Local. One of the continuing aspects from the days before the BRAC started selecting only local agency bridges is the WSDOT voting members. Al wanted to visit the subject as to whether or not the committee feels it is appropriate for WSDOT members to continue to be voting on local agency projects. Al also clarified that the reason for the question is simply that the subject has never been addressed as the Committee evolved and he wanted to give the Committee a chance to voice their opinion.

As with the normalization issue, the Committee saw no need to change the make-up of its members. In general, the Committee values the input and expertise offered by the WSDOT members. The Committee noted that there is no history of problems and recognizes that the WSDOT members have nothing to gain by voting one way or the other.

Committee Roles: Al King said farewell to Jeff Cameron and Gene Soules and thanked them for their service to the Committee. Al then briefly reviewed an article adopted during the Fall 2001 BRAC meeting. The article addresses the question of conflict of interest that arises when a BRAC member's agency present a project for the Committee's consideration.

Project Status Update

Greg Kolle gave the Committee a brief update of the status of the ongoing major bridge projects. The city of Olympia's 4th Avenue bridge project is continuing to move along on schedule. The forming of the variable depth box girders is nearly complete. The city of Mount Vernon's Riverside Bridge is nearing completion with the deck pour scheduled

for May '03. Plans for Douglas County's Chief Joseph Dam Bridge innovative bridge research project are complete and the project is going out to bid. Demolition work has begun on the city of Spokane's Monroe Street Bridge Project. Removal of the deck over the main arch is complete and crews are in the process of removing the spandrel columns. The promenade has been constructed and the first pre-cast copy of the historic bridge railing has been installed.

Review of Criteria and Worksheets

Selection Criteria and Steps Towards Funding: Greg Kolle went through the replacement and rehabilitation criteria handouts. He then went over the final draft of the Major Maintenance criteria and showed the Committee the changes in the Bridge Funding Questionnaire. The 15-year moratorium on further federal funds was discussed. The committee agreed that they wanted to see agencies address as many problems as possible during a Major Maintenance project rather than come back and piece-meal work over years. The committee agreed that a case-by-case approach would be warranted for special cases.

Presentation of Candidates

The agenda was set up for a day-and-a-half meeting with the candidates presented on the second day. The meeting moved along quicker than expected so it was decided to try to finish up in one day if possible. Calls were made to representatives from the city of Tacoma, who planed to be present for the presentation of the rehabilitation candidates, informing them of the change and asking them to come to the afternoon session if possible.

Greg Kolle presented the candidates for the Major Maintenance, Rehabilitation, and Replacement programs. Dan Soderlind and Steve Shanafelt arrived from the city of Tacoma to give the committee an overview of their proposed rehabilitation of the Hylebos Waterway Bridge. The bridge is a movable drawbridge that has been closed since 2001 due to a malfunction in the machinery. The city reported that development at the Port of Tacoma along with the imminent removal of the City Waterway Bridge has prompted the city to seek funding to repair the bridge.

After Dan and Steve's presentation, the discussion of the Hylebos project revolved around the Committees hesitance to fund \$16 million on a bridge project that is expected to be used for 30 years or less. They also had questions about the ultimate plan for the area and where the bridge will fit into such a plan. Another question arose about what seemed to be a low cost estimate for the electrical mechanical work. These questions persisted after the city's responses were discussed.

Following Greg's presentation there was a brief discussion and a question and answer session. Questions were raised about the Barker Road Bridge over Spokane River. It appeared to the Committee that primary driver behind the project was a capacity issue rather than structural problems. They felt a repair would adequately address the

structural problems. The committee saw Barker Road as a better Major Maintenance project. While the Committee agreed that it was proper to fund the removal of the existing deficient Post Street Bridge, they questioned whether it was appropriate to use bridge replacement funds to construct a pedestrian bridge at the Post Street location. The Committee was not inclined to support any Functionally Obsolete bridges on the list or fund rehabilitations to correct functional problems.

At 5:15 p.m. the committee decided to continue the discussion and select projects from the candidate list the following morning. The meeting was adjourned.

Day 2, 9:00 a.m.

The meeting commenced with additional discussion about the Hylebos Bridge. The Committee was inclined to provide Major Maintenance funding in order to get the bridge back in service and reserve the right to provide additional funding when more information could be gathered about the future of the corridor. It was pointed out that some agreements had been worked out during the construction of Interstate 705 and Highway 509. These agreements between the State and the City of Tacoma included restrictions on future funding for the existing bridges that were to become the responsibility of the city. The committee wanted any funding allocated to the Hylebos Bridge to be contingent on the terms of the agreements. The committee also wanted an in-depth inspection to properly assess the condition and feasibility of repairing the bridge along with a cost estimate.

The following is a list of the motions for funding projects along with conditions that apply. These motions were complex and have been reviewed by the BRAC Committee prior to their inclusion in these minutes to ensure accuracy.

Moved by Jeff Cameron, seconded by Derek Pohle:
Recommend fully funding the nine Major Maintenance projects as listed.
Motion passed unanimously

Moved by Jeff Cameron, seconded by Derek Pohle:
Recommend funding for the Rehabilitation project listed as number two, Grays Harbor Cloquallum Creek; and providing a \$5mm reserve for the project listed as number one, Tacoma Hylebos Waterway, as a Major Maintenance project limited to the electrical and mechanical components of the bridge, with the following contingencies:

- agreements on funding for the bridge be researched in view of the significant negotiations and discussions that have occurred during consideration of the SR-509 and I-705 projects and the state project turn backs, with the project being subject to any agreements that may affect it;
- the condition of the entire bridge to be assessed (particularly considering that it has not been inspected since November 2000, and that damage to the draw spans may have occurred during the inadvertent closure) to determine

the current needs and limitations of the entire structure; and considering that work done may be high cost with a limited life on the bridge due to external issues; the condition assessment shall include but not be limited to moveable bridge trusses and deck grating, electrical-mechanical systems, and protection piers; and

- the city provide an area transportation plan to provide the Committee with adequate information to understand the implications of the project in the community so that it may appropriately assess the project against other projects statewide as it considers the high cost and limited available funding.
- The city to present the information necessary to convince the Committee to release the funds to the project at the fall 2003 BRAC meeting.

Motion passed unanimously

Moved by Jeff Cameron, seconded by Jerry Bryant:

Recommend funding only the projects in the Replacement list noted as structurally deficient, with limitations on the project listed as number seven, City of Spokane Post Street, and number twelve, Spokane County, Barker Road.

Those limitations to be:

- Post Street be limited to the cost of removal, estimated at \$1mm.
- Barker Road to be funded as a Major Maintenance project, deck repairs only, estimated at \$1mm.

Motion passed unanimously

The rationale for the limitations on the last two projects were:

- Post Street is to be used as a pedestrian facility, and as such is eligible for BRAC funding only up to the cost for removal.
- Barker Road appears to be in relatively good condition as compared to similar structures across the state, and that deck rehabilitation would appear to provide another 15 years of life at a reasonable cost.

2003 Spring BRAC Minutes

The following is the final list of selected bridges:

Major Maintenance Program

Rank	Agency	Bridge Name	SID Number	\$ Millions
1.	Skagit County	South Fork Bridge - Deck	08236400	0.25
2.	Pierce County	Puyallup River - Deck	08360800	0.40
3.	City of Sumner	Stuck River - Deck	08541900	0.20
4.	Pierce County	Anderson Is. Ferry - E&M	08449800	1.36
5.	Lewis County	Boistfort - Scour	07974100	0.07
6.	Pend Oreille County	lone Bridge - Strengthen	08038700	0.14
7.	Ferry County	Toroda Bridge - Strengthen	08371000	0.06
8.	City of Sumner	Stuck River - Paint	08541900	0.30
9.	Lewis County	Packwood	08201200	0.30
Rehab	City of Tacoma	Hylebos Waterway - E&M	0002376A	5.00
Repl	City of Spokane Valley	Barker Road	08059800	1.00
			Total	9.08

Rehabilitation

Rank	Agency	Bridge Name	SID Number	\$ Millions
2.	Grays Harbor County	Cloquallum Creek	08323800	0.29
			Total	0.29

Replacement

Rank	Agency	Bridge Name	SID Number	\$ Millions
1.	King County	Wagners Bridge	08276500	1.81
2.	Kittitas County	WF Teanaway Rd-MF Tean	07968000	1.61
3.	Chelan County	Old Blewett #1	08682300	0.50
4.	Clark County	Betts	08335600	4.05
5.	Grant County	22.5 NE	08082800	0.17
6.	Walla Walla County	Hood School	08107000	0.70
7.	City of Spokane	Post St. OC Spokane River	08528700	1.00
8.	City of Issaquah	N.W. Juniper	08547800	1.36
9.	Whatcom County	Middle Fork	08157400	3.57
10.	Pend Oreille County	North Fork Calispel Creek	08584900	0.37

2003 Spring BRAC Minutes

Rank	Agency	Bridge Name	SID Number	\$ Millions
11.	Grant County	4 SE	08272500	0.16
13.	Spokane County	Deep Creek	08144000	0.61
14.	City of Ellensburg	Brick Road	08562100	0.29
15.	Grant County	W SE	08151200	0.28
17.	Adams County	Haystack	08048600	0.60
18.	Klickitat County	Harms	08347400	0.62
19.	City of North Bend	North Bend #2	08572700	1.78
21.	Lincoln County	Almira North Bridge	08654200	0.38
23.	Whitman County	Four Mile No. 5	08304600	0.52
25.	Pierce County	Vaughn Bay	07987800	2.09
29.	King County	Sunday Creek	08195100	1.01
			Total	23.48

Future Meeting Dates:

The dates set for the Fall 2003 BRAC meeting were set for October 15th and 16th, 2003.
The location is to be determined.

The dates set for the Spring 2004 BRAC meeting were set for May 5th and 6th, 2004.
Jerry Bryant will check on the availability of a room at Pierce County.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.